UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/695,521	10/695,521 10/28/2003 Hannu Mahonen		KOLS.054PA	5404
76385 Hollingsworth &	7590 08/31/200 & Funk	EXAMINER		
8500 Normanda	ale Lake Blvd., Suite 37	LIM, STEVEN		
Minneapolis, M	II SS4S /		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		2617		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/31/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/695,521	MAHONEN ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	STEVEN LIM	2617	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>12 August 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF			
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance v	, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth i ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing o). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extruder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the siset forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origin	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the data of filing a brief	will not be entered be	201100
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further con (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett	sideration and/or search (see NOT v);	E below);	
appeal; and/or			
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	orresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	1. See attached Notice of Non-Cor	npliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			·
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowed non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	owable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [ how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		be entered and an ex	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1,3-9,12,16-18 and 22-45.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to over showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation <u>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</u></li> </ol>	of the status of the claims after en	try is below or attach	ed.
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Lester Kincaid/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., data is transferred directly from phone to phone) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Suonpera discloses transferring data from a phone to another phone (transferring personalized information from a first hand portable phone ... to a second hand portable phone, Paragraph 3). Regarding applicant's argument that the references fail to disclose a second synchronization step between two devices in response to a first synchronization between the same devices where the second synchronization step includes transferring binding data for the user data unit synchronized in the first synchronization step, Examiner disagrees because the limitation as broadly claimed and interpreted is disclosed by Suonpera et al. as transferring phonebook records from a phone to a PC (Paragraph 61) which is interpreted to be the same as applicant's claimed first synchronization step and subsequently Suonpera discloses message content, profile settings, and other information is read and stored which is interpreted to be the same as applicant's claimed binding data that is transferred during a second synchronization step performed in response to a first synchronization step between the same devices. Therefore the limitations as claimed are disclosed by the references as stated in the Final Rejection.

2